

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 10, and 17 are independent claims. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 6, and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Crane et al. (US 5,899,761), hereinafter "Crane 1." Claims 2, 8, 9, and 17-26 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Crane 1. Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Crane 1 and further in view of Crane et al. (US 5,906,517), hereinafter "Crane 2." The rejections are respectfully traversed. Neither Crane 1 nor Crane 2, taken alone or in combination, describe or suggest the features of the claimed subject matter.

Claim 1 recites, "a main body; at least one connector mounted onto a surface of the main body; and an easel pivotally coupled to the main body."

Crane 1 describes an electrical connector including a base, a contact housing plate, and a cover. See, e.g., Crane 1 at Abstract. The Office Action contends that Crane 1 discloses a main body. Applicant respectfully submits that it is unclear which portion of Crane 1 allegedly teaches the main body recited in claim 1, according to the Office Action. Regardless, Applicant respectfully submits that no portion of Crane 1 describes the main body, as claimed. In this regard, the Specification describes that the main body 104 is a hollow shell. See, e.g., Specification, page 5, lines 5-7. Crane 1 does not teach a main body, as described.

Further, Crane 1 does not describe "at least one connector mounted onto a surface of the main body," as claimed. In this regard, Crane 1 describes electrical receptacles 42 formed on

the front face 40 of the contact housing plate 16. See, e.g., Crane 1, col. 3, lines 43-45. The contact housing plate 16, as described in Crane 1, is not the main body of Crane 1. Further, Crane 1 does not describe that the contact housing plate 16 is the main body, as claimed. Further, the electrical receptacle 42, as described in Crane 1, is not mounted on either the cover 12 or the base 14. Thus, Crane 1 does not describe "at least one connector mounted onto a surface of the main body," as claimed.

Furthermore, the Office Action contends that Crane 1 teaches the easel, as claimed. This contention is respectfully traversed. In this regard, Crane 1 states:

...the lid 80 is hinged to the inclined surface 48' at a top edge 82. The lid 80 is snap fit in both the open and closed positions to prevent accidental release of the lid 80 from the desired position. Thus, the lid 80 facilitates use of the electrical connector 10 by providing better access to the electrical receptacles 42 of the contact housing plate 16. Once a plug is coupled to an electrical receptacle 42, the lid 80 is moved to the closed position in which it shields the connection from unwanted debris.

See, Crane 1, col. 5, lines 1-10.

Thus, as described in Crane 1, the lid 80 is hinged to the top surface 48' of the cover 12. Further, as described in Crane 1, the lid 80 is snap fit in both the open and closed positions. Thus, Crane 1 does not describe that the lid 80 is pivottally coupled to the cover 12, as claimed. Also, Crane 1 does not describe that the electrical receptacles 42 are mounted onto a surface of the cover 12. For this additional reason, Crane 1 does not describe "at least one connector mounted onto a surface of the main body," as claimed.

Therefore, Crane 1 does not describe all the features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable. Claims 2-9 are also patentable at least for reasons similar to claim 1 and for the additional recitations that they contain.

Crane 2 does not rectify the deficiencies in Crane 1. Crane 2 does not describe or suggest the features recited in claim 1. Thus, the suggested combination of Crane 1 and Crane 2 does not describe or suggest all the features of claim 1 and claims dependent therefrom. Accordingly, claims 4 and 5 are also patentable.

Claim 10 is patentable at least for reasons similar to claim 1 and for the additional recitations that they contain. Claims 11-16 are also patentable at least for similar reasons and for the additional recitations that they contain.

With respect to claim 17, the Office Action contends that, based on the teachings of Crane 1, it would have been obvious to have either an edge of the body overlap an edge of the easel or an edge of the easel overlap an edge of the body. See, e.g., Office Action, page 3, paragraph 3. This contention is respectfully traversed.

In this regard, the MPEP states:

If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

See, e.g., MPEP 2143.01, V.

Applicant respectfully submits that modifying Crane 1, as suggested by the Office Action, will render the teachings of Crane 1 unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

Crane 1 describes a cover 12, a base 14, and a lid 80 hinged to the inclined surface 48' on the cover 12. The base 14

includes a front edge 26. Crane 1 teaches that when the prongs of an electrical plug are inserted in the electrical receptacle 42 of the contact housing plate 16, and the lid 80 is snap fitted to the closed position, the lid 80 shields the connection from unwanted debris. See, e.g., Crane 1, col. 5, lines 1-10. Applicant respectfully submits that this intended use of Crane 1 cannot be realized unless the edge of the lid 80 overlaps the front edge 26. If Crane 1 was modified such that the front edge 26 overlaps the lid 80, as suggested by the Office Action, then lid 80 cannot be snap fitted to the closed position in such a manner as to shield the connection from unwanted debris. Thus, a modification of Crane 1, as suggested by the Office Action, renders the electrical connector of Crane 1 unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Therefore, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Crane 1 as suggested by the Office Action.

Further, as discussed previously, Crane 1 does not describe or suggest "an easel with a first edge," as claimed in claim 17. Further, no portion of Crane 1 describes or suggest "at least one foot for supporting the main body," as claimed.

Thus, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Crane 1 as suggested by the Office Action. Further, Crane 1 does not describe or suggest all the features of claim 17. Accordingly, claim 17 is patentable. Claims 18-26 are also patentable at least for reasons similar to claim 1 and for the additional recitations that they contain.

CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant believes no fee is due. However, please apply any credits or additional charges to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/08/07

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott C. Harris  
Reg. No. 32,030  
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
PTO Customer No.: 20985  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, California 92130  
(858) 678-5070 telephone  
(858) 678-5099 facsimile